DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 202 330 HE 013 838

AUTHOR	Boozer, Howard R.; And Others
TITLE	[The Status of Higher Education and the College Environment. Collected Remarks.]
INSTITUTION	Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo. Inservice Education Program.; State Higher Education Executive Officers Association.
SPONS AGENCY	Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.
REPORT NO	IEP-008; IEP-511; IEP-912-4
PUB DATE	78
NOTE	10p.; Papers presented at Seminars for State Leaders in Postsecondary Education.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Access to Education; Affirmative Action; *College Admission; Court Litigation; Educational History; Educational Trends; Ethnic Groups; *Government School Relationship; *Higher Education; Minority Groups; Political Influences; Resource Allocation; State Agencies; *State Boards of Education
IDENTIFIERS	Bakke v Regents of University of California; *Seminars for State Leaders Postsec Ed (ECS SHEEO); Supreme Court

ABSTRACT

Conference papers and panel remarks concerning the role of state coordinating or governing boards, trends in higher education since before World War II, and implications of the Bakke decision are presented as part of an inservice education program. In "Life in the Centrifuge--Panel Remarks," Howard R. Boozer suggests that higher education as part of a political arena has to compete for resources. Governors and legislatures have created planning, coordinating, and governing boards to assist them in allocating available resources. The boards must interact with institutions, state government, local and regional interests, and federal interests. In "College: The Center of the Universe," G. Theodore Mitau describes the atmosphere of higher education before and after World War II with reference to academic requirements, the mission of state teachers colleges, land-grant universities, liberal arts colleges, faculty recruitment. broadened access with the G. I. Bill of Rights, the importance of a college education for personal success, and the continuing growth in enrollments in the 1960s. Additionally, a summary of remarks of Luis Nogales concerning the Bakke decision is presented. Among the points are the following: the use of race as an admission parameter has been affirmed; there is a need to redress the underrepresentation of educationally disadvantaged ethnic groups in graduate and professional programs; the same minority groups who are underrepresented in advanced educational programs are the most underserved in critical human service areas, such as health care and legal assistance. Steps that state agencies and institutions can take are suggested. (SW)

Inservice Education Program (IEP)

ED202330

Paper Presented at a Seminar for State Leaders in Postsecondary Education

(THE STATUS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE COLLEGE ENVIRONMENT. COLLECTED REMARKS)

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ECS

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

1978

Howard R. Boozer, G. Theodore Mitau, Luis Nogales

NE 013830

IEP-008
IEP-511

IEP Reprint No. 912-4

Education Commission of the States

Inservice Education Program (IEP)
Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80295

SHEEO

The IEP Program has been supported primarily by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation with additional funds from the Education Commission of the States, the Frost Foundation and the State Higher Education Executive Officers

LIFE IN THE CENTRIFUGE -- PANEL REMARKS

AT ECS/SHEEO NATIONAL SEMINAR*

St. Petersburg, Florida, January 27, 1976

by
Howard R. Boozer, Executive Director
South Carolina Commission on Higher Education

All of us here, in our own ways, relate to and can illustrate from our own experience the problems and issues that have been raised for discussion. Working for a state coordinating or governing board puts one squarely in the middle -- at a busy intersection with traffic bearing down from every direction. Jerry Ziegler's recital of the problems, issues, and competing forces -- and Lyman Glenny's discussion of staffing patterns and problems -- underscore anew for all of us the importance of planning, coordination, and governance in higher education, and the inherent frustrations that are not apt to go away. It is an interesting and challenging life, both exhilarating and depressing -- I am confident that those who survive are true masochists, if nothing else.

Time was when the higher education enterprise was much simpler and neater -- but the past always looks more comprehensible and manageable than the present. The laissez-faire mode, permitted public colleges and universities in the past, however, is gone forever. States must look to the best possible allocation of their resources among competing and necessary social purposes -- higher education, public education, health,

---

*This National Seminar was sponsored by the ECS/SHEEO Inservice Education Program, on "Examining the Relationship of State Postsecondary Education Boards to Institutions and Local, State and Federal Offices and Agencies." These remarks were made in response to papers presented by Jerome M. Ziegler ("Who Controls, Who Will Control Higher Education?") and Lyman A. Glenny ("Organizational and Staffing Changes in the Agencies Concerned with Postsecondary Education").

corrections, etc. In this era, the states cannot and will not leave it up to the institutions unilaterally to pursue their own unbridled ambitions without some restraint and balancing against the other public needs that must be met.

Higher education must be in this political arena, along with all other government-supported activities. The question of who controls, or who should or will control, higher education is a non sequitur. There are many answers, and there are no answers, to that question. Ultimately the people control, through their elected spokesmen in the legislative and executive branches.

John Gardner was in Columbia recently on behalf of Common Cause; I heard him say in a luncheon address that "in the give and take of a democratic society equally worthy groups often seek mutually incompatible goals." This is the problem the legislatures and governors face, and the question, it seems to me, is how can they allocate the available resources to assure their most effective use in serving the public good. They have created planning, coordinating, and governing boards to assist them in arriving at their decisions. The legislators and governors need recommendations based on objective analyses of statewide resources and needs. Special pleading they do not need.

Most state coordinating boards or commissions, or governing boards, were created as an effort by the legislatures to deal with institutional competition, political infighting, and harassment by institutional lobbyists. Legislators were under constant and unremitting pressure from special interest groups, and recognized the near impossibility of evaluating claims on their merits. They did not, individually, have the time or the means

to give in-depth study to the needs of higher education, given the broad range of other public concerns to which they also had to give attention. They needed a buffer to help them arrive at reasoned and responsible decisions. But legislators are an ambivalent lot. They are unhappy with the political heat, but they are also jealous of their right to make the decisions.

Coordinating boards or commissions, in particular, are in the middle -- no alumni, no constituencies -- and there is no way out and no place to hide for such agencies. They must face in all directions at once -- the institutions, the legislature and the governor, local and regional interests, and federal interests. They must be concerned with institutional freedom, autonomy, and aspirations on the one hand and with statewide needs on the other, and strive for an optimum balance between these often opposing forces. Finally, they must, to succeed, be properly constituted with members of recognized stature, be adequately and professionally staffed, and develop credibility and earn confidence through the quality of their advice and recommendations.

#

College: The Center of the Universe

by G. Theodore Mitau

Before World War II, to most of the faculty, students and boards of trustees, their particular college or university campus with its unique and peculiar qualities represented the center of their academic universe. Good presidents were expected to be charismatic leaders and architects of greatness; not infrequently, however, they turned out to be benign dictators. Collegial loyalties were focused on the institution to which alumni returned periodically to regain spiritual strength as well as to compare notes on how life affected former classmates and friends.

Curriculum committees determined programs that were built around a core of concepts of what a liberal arts education ought to be and how it might provide the student with a "kit of conceptual tools" appropriate for successful living. Academic requirements were set high—very high—for most of the selective colleges and universities and program requirements were based on the assumption that the faculty could delineate with confidence and certitude the "universal" academic qualities of an educated man or woman.

For the state teachers colleges, their mission was precise and clear: to be widely accessible and to educate as many teachers as possible. They provided instructional personnel for thousands of school districts throughout the state and nation. Land-grant universities, in many ways this country's most unique contribution to the postsecondary education model, also had their own clearly defined mission. They focused on agricultural research, extension work, professional education in the fields of law, medicine, engineering and all advanced graduate training for the professoriate.

At the smaller liberal arts colleges, faculties treated presidents with deference and respect, as a frown on the poor man's forehead might result in a tenure deferred or professorship denied. At the larger and more prestigious institutions, departmental chairmen had a great deal of power while they or their senior colleagues set academic tone and tenor.

Faculty recruitment occurred at national and professional meetings in an informal and personal mode with success determined by the quality of personal or network contacts. Prestigious institutions determined salary levels, "working conditions" and perquisites of office. Entrepreneurial professors waved telegrams to impress trustees and presidents with their importance and scholarly worth—the more telegrams, the higher the salary, the larger the office, the lighter the teaching load and more "attractive" the secretary. Most of American public opinion respected and trusted its colleges and universities and the values for which they claimed to stand.

G. Theodore Mitau is Distinguished Service Professor of Political Science and former Chancellor of the Minnesota State University System.

Following World War II and well into the fifties, things began to change. Sputnik and Soviet Russia's scientific/technological advances had made their impact on the world. Science faculty walked a little more proudly as science course enrollments climbed and requirements continued to escalate. America had to keep up with Soviet Russia's move into space and our colleges and universities promised to be the indispensable resource in this new race for power and progress. Higher education represented the most widely accepted and efficacious credentializing mechanism for personal upward mobility as well as for national power.

With the G.I. Bill of Rights in place, this country developed one of its most creative and massive strategies to broaden access to higher education for literally millions of our fellow citizens who without such financial assistance would never have dreamed that they might be able to obtain a college education. Mass higher education had become a reality. With the G.I. Bill came good dollars and the veterans were warmly welcomed—they offered good potential and strength of motivation.

Less than half of the students were attending private colleges and even that percentage was declining as enrollment at community colleges, junior colleges and four-year state colleges grew at fantastic rates. Legislatures willingly provided ample funds for the public sector while private corporations and foundations rallied to private postsecondary institutions. In these early post-World War II years, program evaluation and academic audits were unheard of in either public or private collegiate institutions as faculties chose the curriculum within limits set by presidents, boards and the occasional pulling and tugging of strong alumni influences.

In the public sector of higher education, where colleges and universities looked to the capitol for funding, legislative committees found themselves understaffed and lacking analytical capability or "timerity" to take on the sophisticated budgets of state colleges and universities. After all, during these post-war years the overriding thrust was to get students into college, not keep them out. People would talk with their state legislators asking for their influence to help their boys or girls gain college admission. No one pressured legislators to check program quality or review academic budgets. Successful completion of a collegiate education represented the best assurance for upward mobility and personal success. Higher education experienced its "gilded era."

In such a setting, "adult" education and community education represented largely tangential areas of interest to colleges and universities. Academic standards for such extension programs were generally marginal, the faculties were less experienced and the offerings were viewed as rounding out an institution's community service while giving junior professors an opportunity for moonlighting.

The focus of attention was to the undergraduate—the eighteen- to twenty-two-year-olds. Curricular programs were directive and requirements specific (102 follows 101 and 202 follows 201). Before graduating, students approached the registrar's desk, with knees trembling, hoping that all of the necessary requirements were met and that their transcripts proved free from non-transferable or "non-interchangeable" offerings from other institutions since these were rarely accepted and generally devalued.

As enrollments continued to rise and new colleges emerged almost weekly in the sixties, faculty members moved frequently to improve their positions, and anyone who had a bachelor degree or some graduate work seemed safely launched for life on a professorial career. Academic morale was high; the nation's commitment to remake the world through the increased education of its eager men and women seemed unshakable. Professors were the gatekeepers to the new Camelot. Those were the days before performance standards, zero-based budgets, rigid staffing patterns and resource requirements became popular. Only very bad institutions and very bad departments seemed incapable of surviving.

Those were also the days when higher education appeared very little concerned about how many women, blacks or minorities were included in a department's faculty or student body. An institution's or a department's worth was measured in terms of doctorate degrees and of the number of its faculty members who came from Princeton, Harvard, Yale or Berkeley.

Concepts of inter-institutional cooperation or consortial relationships were rarely brought up. While some of the private colleges began to join in the establishment of private college councils, to coordinate their financial drives for corporate and foundation giving, some of the larger universities were beginning to establish branch campuses to respond to the emerging needs for higher education throughout the different regions of the state. Such institutions tended to remain, in most instances, under the direct control of the central campus and administration.

Faculty avoided unions since unions seemed designed to meet the needs of plumbers, blue collar workers and other kinds of people. Many joined the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). That organization's major concern centered on issues of academic freedom and professorial advancement. Faculty members were proud to be academics, a profession onto itself, something of an enclave in the working world. They seemed certain of what the future might bring and confident of the basic curricular configurations that they designed and protected. This, then, was a period when higher education expressed faith in itself, in the centrality of its social position and in the promising future of its institutions.

SUMMARY OF REMARKS OF LUIS NOGALES
VICE CHAIRPERSON, CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY
EDUCATION COMMISSION

1. The significance of race in American life and the use of race, within certain parameters in admissions decisions has been affirmed.

2. The legal questions are behind us. The major issue facing colleges and universities is designing procedures and institutional environments that take into account the need to redress the underrepresentation of educationally disadvantaged ethnic groups in post-baccalaureate educational programs and in the professions.

3. Returning to the status quo--because the Courts have upheld the admissions procedures in effect at many institutions--is not sufficient. The status quo is inadequate in terms of overcoming underrepresentation. We must recapture our sense of momentum and our sense of urgency.

4. The same minority groups that are underrepresented in graduate and professional programs are the most underserved in critical human service areas, such as health care and legal assistance. Health care in our inner-city and rural communities, as measured by ratios of physicians to population, is dramatically deficient and reflects the problem of maldistribution of services. The communities experiencing these deficiencies have more illness, higher infant mortality, and less contact with state and national averages. With respect to legal services, it has been estimated that only 15% of the legal needs of the poor are being met and that less than .5% of all lawyers work full-time with the nation's poor.

5. The post-Bakke agenda:

   First, we must recognize and take steps to counteract

   --the negative psychological effects of the case and of the two years affirmative action programs were in limbo while the case was before the courts. Reaffirmations of commitment by governors, legislatures, state postsecondary education commissions and colleges and universities are needed.

--State postsecondary education commissions should take responsibility for disseminating accurate information regarding the case.

--Legislatures and state commissions should make explicit statements of the substantial state interest in overcoming underrepresentation in educational programs and in achieving better distribution of human services.

--Finally, while the establishment and implementation of admissions criteria is a legal and professional responsibility of institutions and departments, funding and reviewing agencies at the state level should require those responsible to do the following:

1. Demonstrate that admissions policies take into account the human services needs of underserved communities and that efforts are made to seek out and to admit qualified students most likely to address those needs in their professional careers;

2. Demonstrate that specific admissions criteria are sensitive to unmet human services needs, and that such needs are considered when opportunity is allocated among qualified applicants; and

3. Demonstrate that concerns for the distribution and effectiveness of human services are taken into account.

6. These suggestions are starting points for developing the post-Bakke agenda.